

Appln No. 09/607,844
Amdt. Dated May 24, 2004
Reply to Office action of March 10, 2004

2

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action has been carefully considered. The issues raised are traversed and addressed below with reference to the relevant headings and paragraph numbers appearing under the Detailed Action of the Office Action.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

In Paragraph 2, the Examiner has objected that the current invention is not novel in light of Roberts. We respectfully submit to the Examiner that this is not the case.

The current invention describes a printer module that generates a first print media using first information from a database. The printer also includes an identifier applicator that applies an identifier to the first print media. The user designates or selects the identifier on the first print media. For example, the user can select the indicator on the first print media with a pen. The process of the user selecting the identifier results in the printer module printing a second print media. The second information that is printed on the second print media will be the result of the user selecting the indicator on the first print media.

For example, the user prints out a first print media such as a web page. The user selects a hyperlink on the first print media with a pen, by pressing the pen on the hyperlink. This selection result in the printer unit printing a second print media representing the web page corresponding to the hyperlink selected

Roberts describes printing on a partially complete ticket from a terminal, therefore generating a complete ticket. The partially complete ticket is provided with pre-printed information, which only partially indicates a win/lose outcome. The terminal prints additional information onto the partially complete ticket to indicate the win/lose outcome for the purchaser. Roberts also describes a vending machine that stores the partially completed tickets, wherein when a ticket is purchased, a printer will print the additional information onto the partially complete ticket, subsequently completing the ticket.

However, there is no disclosure in Roberts of the ticket being first partially printed by a printer module to generate the partially complete ticket (first print media), and then the partially complete ticket being printed by the same print module to generate the complete ticket (second print module). It would be appreciated that the system described includes a partially complete ticket that must have been printed using a separate printer module. Thus for example, Roberts specifies that the partially printed tickets are "stored" in the vending machine with the pre-printed data, therefore indicating that a separate printing module would have printed the first information.

Claim 1 of the current invention requires that the first and second media being generated by the same printer module. The current invention clearly shows this with reference to Figure 2, where the first and second print media is generated by the same printer module.

Appln No. 09/607,844
Amdt. Dated May 24, 2004
Reply to Office action of March 10, 2004

3

It is also noted Roberts discloses the terminal validating a winning ticket. However, this document fails to describe that second information is printed in this validation process, and additionally fails to describe generating any printed media at all through validation. Claim 1 of the current invention requires that the second information must be printed by the same printer module which generated the first print media, and clearly Roberts does not disclose these features.

In the event that the Examiner is minded to find that Roberts does disclose a single printer for printing the first and second information, we submit that in any event Roberts fails to describe an identifier applicator, as required by claim 1 of the current invention. Roberts fails to describe how the 'pre-printed' data, which includes the identifier, is generated on the partially complete ticket. It would be appreciated, however, that practically the ticket would have likely been purchased from a supplier, where a separate printer module would have been used to print the identifier, and most likely specialised printing materials such as the "rub off" material, and therefore clearly is not part of the system. Claim 1 of the current invention requires that an indicator applicator must be included in the printer module, and clearly Roberts fails to disclose such a system.

In the event that the Examiner is still minded to maintain the objections in light of Roberts, we argue that Roberts does not disclose a generating a first and second print media. Roberts describes printing twice on the same print media (the ticket). In contrast, claim 1 of the current invention requires that a first print media is generated by the printer unit, wherein the user designates the identifier on the first print media, subsequently the printer responds to the user's interaction by generating a second print media. These features are not disclosed in Roberts.

We also note that the system disclosed by Roberts does not include the user designating the identifier on the print media. The system described by Roberts does not describe the user having any interaction with the identifier, but rather the terminal interacting with the identifier. This is clearly in contrast to the current invention, wherein the designation of the identifier by the user is a specific feature of the invention, which results in the printer module generating a second printed media, as required by claim 1.

We respectfully submit that the combination of these inventive feature described above would not have been obvious in light of Roberts.

Similar comments apply to independent claims 26, 32 and 34 due to the corresponding combination of features they define.

It is respectfully submitted that the remaining claims are novel based on their dependence on the independent claims.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

In Paragraph 4, the Examiner has referred to Holmes, but we believe that the comments are based on Roberts. If this assumption is incorrect, please let us know.

Appln No. 09/607,844
Amdt. Dated May 24, 2004
Reply to Office action of March 10, 2004

4

In any event, as previously highlighted, Roberts does not disclose the generation of two printed media whereby the second printed media is generated as a result of user interaction with an identifier on the first media, as required by claim 1. Additionally, Roberts does not disclose an identifier applicator, as required by claim 1. Finally, Roberts clearly does not disclose the printing of first and second information being performed by the same printer module, as required by claim 1.

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the objections and claim rejections have been successfully traversed and addressed. The amendments do not involve adding any information that was not already disclosed in the specification, and therefore no new matter is added. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the claims 1 to 35, and the application as a whole with these claims, are allowable, and a favourable reconsideration is therefore earnestly solicited.

Further consideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Very respectfully,

Applicant:



KIA SILVERBROOK



PAUL LAPSTUN

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
393 Darling Street
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com

Telephone: +612 9818 6633

Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762